

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14 and 16-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 12, 13 and 15 were previously canceled, and claim 5 is canceled herein. Claims 19-24 have been added, and claims 1, 3, 9 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

The pending claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushihi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0044092, hereinafter “Kushihi”), in view of Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,255,994, hereinafter “Saito”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, specifically recites that the components "are physically attached to a main surface of the patch antenna." The other independent claims include similar limitations. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest components that are attached to a patch antenna.

The pending claims relate to an antenna assembly with improved tuning capabilities because interaction between the tuning components and the RF circuitry that is mounted on the printed circuit board is reduced as the components are separated from the PCB carrying RF circuitry. Further, the interaction between a user (e.g., a user's hand holding a mobile communication device comprising a current antenna assembly) and the tuning components or the antenna is reduced. Tuning the antenna by use of these components (that may be discrete components) is less susceptible to electromagnetic interference.

The Office Action alleges that the cited documents disclose components that are attached to a patch antenna. Review of the cited reference, however, reveals that Kushihi's LC parallel resonant circuit (tuning components) is only connected electrically to the power supply side of

the antenna conductor (*see* paragraphs 54, 60). Figure 1 of Kushihi shows a patch antenna 2 electrically connected with two block circuits 3 and 4. The connection is, according to the figure, a mere electric one which is consistent with the depiction as a block inside a dashed circumferential line each. There is no disclosure where the tuning elements are arranged physically. This is in contrast to the present invention where the components are physically attached to a main surface of the patch antenna (see, e.g., Fig. 2 of the present application for an example).

In response to Applicant's argument in the Amendment after Final Rejection, the Examiner noted that the claims merely stated that the components were "attached to the planar antenna" and this specific feature was not recited in the claims. This issue has been resolved by explicitly stating that the components are physically attached to a main surface of the antenna. *See also*, newly added claims 19-22, which require that the components are physically located between the antenna and the ground plane. The prior art of record provides absolutely no indication that the components could be placed at the specifically required locations.

Since each of the pending claims requires the components to be attached to a specific portion of the antenna and the prior art does not teach this limitation, it is respectfully requested that the present application be passed to issuance.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Any fee deemed due by the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

February 6, 2009  
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Ira S. Matsil/  
Ira S. Matsil  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,272